

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MARK TUNNE,

Plaintiff,

-against-

DISOCVER FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,
dba DISCOVERED CARD, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

22-CV-5288 (JGLC)

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION**

JESSICA G. L. CLARKE, United States District Judge:

This motion to dismiss was referred to Magistrate Judge Figueredo for a Report and Recommendation. *See* ECF Nos. 59, 61. In the Report and Recommendation filed on May 13, 2024, Magistrate Judge Figueredo recommended that the motion be granted in part and denied in part. *See* ECF No. 68.

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court “must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). To accept those portions of the report to which no timely objection has been made, however, a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record. *See, e.g., Wilds v. United Parcel Serv.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). This clearly erroneous standard also applies when a party makes only conclusory or general objections, or simply reiterates his original arguments. *See, e.g., Ortiz v. Barkley*, 558 F. Supp. 2d 444, 451 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).

In the present case, the Report and Recommendation advised the parties that they had fourteen days from service of the Report and Recommendation to file any objections, and

warned that failure to timely file such objections would result in waiver of any right to object. See ECF No. 68 at 32. In addition, the Report and Recommendation expressly called the parties' attention to Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). *Id.* Nevertheless, as of the date of this Order, no objections have been filed and no request for an extension of time to object has been made. Accordingly, the parties have waived the right to object to the Report and Recommendation or to obtain appellate review. *See Frank v. Johnson*, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir. 1992); *see also Cidor v. Onondaga County*, 517 F.3d 601 (2d Cir. 2008).

Despite the waiver, the Court has reviewed the petition and the Report and Recommendation, unguided by objections, and finds the Report and Recommendation to be well reasoned and grounded in fact and law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is **ADOPTED** in its entirety. Should Plaintiff choose to do so, Plaintiff is directed to file a second amended complaint by **July 10, 2024**.

Plaintiff has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right and, accordingly, a certificate of appealability will not issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); *see also, e.g.*, *Matthews v. United States*, 682 F.3d 180, 185 (2d Cir. 2012). In addition, this Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith, and *in forma pauperis* status is thus denied. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate ECF No. 59 and to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 10, 2024
New York, New York

Jessica Clarke
JESSICA G. L. CLARKE
United States District Judge